

REMARKS

Claims 7 - 8, 11 - 13, 20, and 31 - 33 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced with these amendments, all of which are supported in the application as originally filed. Claims 14 - 19 and 21 - 30 have been cancelled from the application without prejudice. Claims 3 - 5, 7 - 9, 11 - 13, 20, and 31 - 33 remain in the application.

Applicants are not conceding that the subject matter encompassed by the claims as presented prior to this Amendment is not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as claim amendments and cancellations in the present application are directed toward facilitating expeditious prosecution of the application and allowance of the currently-presented claims at an early date. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue claims, including the subject matter encompassed by the claims as presented prior to this Amendment and additional claims, in one or more continuing applications.

I. Rejection under 35 U. S. C. §101

Paragraph 7 on Page 2 of the Office Action dated February 22, 2008 (hereinafter, “the Office Action”) states that Claims 24 - 25 are rejected under 35 U. S. C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 24 - 25 have been cancelled from the application without prejudice, rendering this rejection moot.

II. Rejection under 35 U. S. C. §103(a)

Paragraph 4 on Page 4 of the Office Action states that Claims 3 - 5, 7 - 9, and 11 - 33 are

rejected under 35 U. S. C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent Publication 2005/0149847 to Chandler in view of U. S. Patent Publication 2004/0168115 to Bauernschmidt et al. (hereinafter, “Bauernschmidt”). Claims 14 - 19 and 21 - 30 have been cancelled from the application without prejudice, rendering the rejection moot as to those claims. This rejection is respectfully traversed with regard to the remaining claims as currently presented.

Referring first to Applicants’ independent Claim 13, the Office Action admits on Page 5, lines 17 - 23 that Chandler “fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation of generating output objects ...” (referring to claim language previously recited on lines 3 - 6 of Claim 13). Bauernschmidt is then cited, referring to para. [0034] thereof. Para. [0034] of Bauernschmidt discusses use of an XSL stylesheet for filtering elements. See, for example, the portion of para. [0034] appearing at page 6, left column, lines 2 - 16, stating “... the distribution tool **150** may include a filter element that filters select elements from the report data sets ... an [XSLT] processor may be included in the distribution tool to convert the report data sets ... to a new XML document or other text document using an XSLT stylesheet to determine which elements are filtered ...”.

Applicants have amended Claim 13 herein, and respectfully submit that neither Chandler nor Bauernschmidt, nor any combination thereof (assuming, *arguendo*, that such combination could be made and that one of skill in the art would be motivated to attempt it), teaches all limitations of Claim 13 as currently presented. The XSLT stylesheet of Bauernschmidt, for example, is not a [second] schema definition, as claimed by Applicants on lines 5 - 6 *et seq.* of

Claim 13.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 13 is patentable over the references.

Referring next to independent Claim 31, the Office Action admits on Page 12, lines 10 - 17 that Chandler “fails to explicitly disclose the further limitations of suppressing ...” (referring to claim language previously recited on lines 9 - 16 of Claim 31). Bauernschmidt is then cited, referring to para. [0034] thereof. Para. [0034] of Bauernschmidt has been discussed above.

Applicants have amended Claim 31 herein, and respectfully submit that neither Chandler nor Bauernschmidt, nor any combination thereof (assuming, *arguendo*, that such combination could be made and that one of skill in the art would be motivated to attempt it), teaches all limitations of Claim 31 as currently presented. The XSLT stylesheet of Bauernschmidt, for example, is not a [second] schema definition, as claimed by Applicants on lines 5 - 6 *et seq.* of Claim 31.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 31 is patentable over the references.

Referring next to independent Claim 32, the Office Action admits on Page 13, lines 15 - 19 that Chandler “fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation of omitting ...” (referring to

claim language previously recited on lines 5 - 8 of Claim 32). Bauernschmidt is then cited, referring to para. [0034] thereof. Para. [0034] of Bauernschmidt has been discussed above.

Applicants have amended Claim 32 herein, and respectfully submit that neither Chandler nor Bauernschmidt, nor any combination thereof (assuming, *arguendo*, that such combination could be made and that one of skill in the art would be motivated to attempt it), teaches all limitations of Claim 32 as currently presented. The XSLT stylesheet of Bauernschmidt, for example, is not a [second] schema definition, as claimed by Applicants on lines 9 - 10 *et seq.* of Claim 32.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 32 is patentable over the references.

Dependent Claims 3 - 5, 7 - 9, 11 - 12, 20, and 33 are deemed patentable by virtue of (at least) the patentability of the independent claims from which they depend.

In view of the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the §103 rejection of all remaining claims as currently presented.

III. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending rejected claims, withdrawal of all presently outstanding rejections, and allowance of all remaining claims at an early date.

Respectfully submitted,

/Marcia L. Doubet/

Marcia L. Doubet
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 40,999

Customer Number for Correspondence: 43168

Phone: 407-343-7586

Fax: 407-343-7587